UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,335	06/26/2001	Jin-Lin Chen	MS1-913US	1132

22801	7590	12/17/2004	

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/893,335	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Almari Yuan	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>26 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>26 June 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 6/26/2001.

2.   Claims 1-58 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 6, 15, 16, 25, 26, 29, 31, 43, 45, 53, and

54 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   Applicant's cited the following references in the specification:

on page 2: Smith et al., in Scalable Multimedia Delivery for Pervasive Computing,

Proc., ACM Multimedia 99, 1999, pp. 131-140.

on page 20: Easter et al., A Density-Based Algorithm for Discovering Clusters in Large

Spatial Databases with Noise ", In Proc KDD'96, 1996.

on page 21: Ukkonen, On-line Construction Suffix Trees, Algorithmica, 14(3), Sept.

1995, pp. 249-260.

on page 23 : Hammer et al., Extracting Semistructured Information from the Web, Proc.

Workshop on Management of Semistructured Data (PODS/SIGMOD'97), May 1997.

on page 23: Lim et al., An Automated Approach for Retrieving Hierarchical Data from

HTML Table, In Proc. ClKM'99, 1999, Kansas City, MO, pp. 466-474.

on page 34: Chen et al., An Adaptive Web Content Delivery System, Proc. AH2000,

Springer, 2000, pp. 284-288.

Applicant is advised to submit an Information Disclosure Statement and copies of the

cited publications to be considered by the Examiner (see MPEP § 609).

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 30 and 55 are objected because of the following informalities:

Regarding dependent claims 30 and 55, the term "WAP"-enabled is an acronym and

should be defined for better understanding of the claimed limitation. Applicant is advised to

define "WAP" as Wireless Application Protocol in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   **Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over**

Anderson et al. (USPN 5,537,526 – issued on 7/1996) in view of Bergman (USPN 6,564,263

B1 – filed 12/1999), and further in view of Mäkipää et al. (USPN 6,556,217 B1 – filed

06/2000).

Regarding independent claim 29 and (claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-12, 15-17, 18-22, 25-26, 31-40, 43-

54, and 56-58), Anderson discloses:

One or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which,

when executed by one or more processors, cause the one or more processors to:

analyze one or more functions associated with a page that is configured for presentation

on a first device type (Anderson on col. 14, line 26 – col. 15, line 30 teaches one ore more

commands associated with the document) by generating one or more function-based object

models that represent objects (Anderson on col. 13, lines 16-42 teaches Model Command

Objects operating with the command objects to change model) comprising the page, said objects

comprising:

one or more basic objects associated with the page, objects comprising a smallest

information body that cannot be further divided, said one or more objects (Anderson see Abstract

and col. 1, line 59- col. 2, line 5 teaches object oriented framework of a compound document to

support changes using command objects) being configured to perform one or more of the

following functions:

(1) providing semantic information, (1) navigating to other objects, (3) providing a visual

effect on the webpage, and (4) enabling user interaction (Anderson on col. 11, lines 13-24

teaches providing data presentation to be viewed and/or modified by the user and on col. 1, line

59 – col. 2, line 5 teaches framework of the document provide support of document changes);

said generating of the one or more function-based object models comprising generating at

least one function-based object model for a object (Anderson on col. 13, lines 16-42 teaches

Model Command Objects for command objects that operates on the model to change the model),

said at least one function-based object model being generated as a function of one or more of the

following properties: (1) a presentation property that defines a way in which the object is

presented, (3) a decoration property pertaining to an extent to which the basic objects serves to

decorate the page, (4) a hyperlink property pertaining to an object to which the basic object

points via a hyperlink, and (5) a interaction property pertaining to an interaction method of the

basic object (Anderson on col. 4, lines 51-61 teaches the user can provide links within the

document framework and on col. 14, line 26 – col. 15, line 39 teaches commands used to manipulate the display of a compound document).

However, Anderson does not explicitly disclose "basic object" and "clustering relationship property pertaining to a relationship among root children of the composite object, presentation relationship property pertaining to a presentation order associated with the root children of the composite object" and "composite objects comprising objects that contain other objects, said one or more composite objects having a clustering function".

Bergman on col. 21, lines 48-60 teaches simple and composite objects; on col. 3, lines 36-51 and col. 17, lines 29-40 teaches relationships between presentation objects; and on col. 6, lines 62-64 teaches specification of semantics and syntax for combining media objects into composite objects.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bergman into Anderson to provide simple and composite objects and define presentation relationship of an object, as taught by Bergman, incorporated into the object oriented framework of Anderson, in order to provide a unified framework.

However, Anderson and Bergman do not explicitly disclose "adapt the webpage for presentation on a second device type that is different from the first device type".

Mäkipää discloses adapting page to be displayed based on the device capabilities (col. 3, lines 14-46).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to

adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 4, 9, 13, and 27, Mäkipää discloses "adapting in view of one or more networking conditions" teaches adapting page to be displayed based on the device capabilities and network volume (col. 2, lines 1-23).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 5, 14, and 28, Mäkipää discloses "adapting comprises doing so in view of one or more user preferences", on col. 5, line 65 teaches user profile.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 10 and 24, Mäkipää discloses "adapting comprises applying one or more rules", on col. 3, lines 14-28 teaches layout rules.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 23 and 41, Mäkipää discloses "using rule-based decision tree" on col. 3, lines 14-28 teaches rules are defined in a layout structure.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claims 30 and 55, Mäkipää discloses "adapt the webpage for presentation on a WAP-enabled device", on col. 2, lines 1-23 teaches WAP device.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Mäkipää into Anderson and Bergman to provide a way to adapt page based on device capabilities, as taught by Mäkipää, incorporated in the systems of Anderson and Bergman, in order to allow maximum utilization of a device for the user.

Regarding dependent claim 42, Bergman discloses "assigning a category from a set of object categories", on col. 8, lines 10-19 teaches categories of data.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bergman into Anderson to provide simple and composite objects and define presentation relationship of an object, as taught by Bergman, incorporated into the object oriented framework of Anderson, in order to provide a unified framework.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

AY
December 13, 2004